

The GLMRIS Report

Appendix J - Civil Design



USACE
01/06/2014



CONTENTS

J.1	INTRODUCTION	J-1
J.1.1	Purpose and Scope.....	J-1
J.1.2	Existing Survey Data	J-1
J.1.3	Figures and Mapping.....	J-2
J.2	HYDRO-SEPARATION BARRIERS	J-3
J.2.1	Wilmette (IL) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)	J-3
J.2.2	Chicago (IL) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)	J-4
J.2.3	Hammond (IN) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation, CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)	J-5
J.2.4	Alsip (IL) Separation Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC [Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal] Open Alternative)	J-6
J.2.5	Calumet City (IL) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation).....	J-8
J.2.6	Stickney (IL) Separation Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)	J-9
J.2.7	Oak Lawn (IL) Separation Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative, Flow Bypass Alternative).....	J-10
J.2.8	State Line (IL/IN) Separation Barrier (Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative, CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative)	J-10
J.3	MITIGATION DESIGN.....	J-12
J.3.1	New Reservoir at Oak Lawn (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative, Flow Bypass Alternative)	J-12
J.3.2	New Reservoir at State Line (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)	J-13
J.3.3	Second Reservoir at McCook (Flow Bypass Alternative)	J-15
J.3.3.1	Tunnel System.....	J-15
J.3.3.2	Reservoir	J-15
J.3.4	Second Reservoir at McCook (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation).....	J-17
J.3.4.1	Tunnel System.....	J-17
J.3.4.2	Reservoir	J-18
J.3.5	Second Reservoir at McCook (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)	J-20
J.3.5.1	Tunnel System.....	J-20
J.3.5.2	Reservoir	J-21
J.3.6	Second Reservoir at Thornton (Flow Bypass Alternative)	J-23
J.3.6.1	Tunnel System.....	J-23
J.3.6.2	Reservoir	J-24
J.3.7	Second Reservoir at Thornton (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)	J-26
J.3.7.1	Tunnel System.....	J-26
J.3.7.2	Reservoir.....	J-27
J.3.8	Second Reservoir at Thornton (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)	J-29
J.3.8.1	Tunnel System.....	J-29
J.3.8.2	Reservoir	J-30

CONTENTS (CONT.)

J.3.9	Second Reservoir at Thornton (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative)	J-31
J.3.9.1	Tunnel System.....	J-31
J.3.9.2	Reservoir	J-32
J.4	TECHNOLOGY FEATURES	J-35
J.4.1	Chicago (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative)	J-35
J.4.2	T.J. O'Brien (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative, CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative)	J-36
J.4.3	Brandon Road (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative).....	J-37
J.4.4	Stickney (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (Flow Bypass Alternative)	J-38
J.4.5	Alsip (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (Flow Bypass Alternative)	J-39
J.5	REAL ESTATE.....	J-41

LIST OF ENCLOSURES

ENCLOSURE A – REAL ESTATE SUMMARY.....	J-43
ENCLOSURE B – GENERAL CALCULATIONS.....	J-51
ENCLOSURE C – CUT AND FILL REPORTS	J-55

FIGURES

J.2.1	WILMETTE BARRIER (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION)	J-4
J.2.2	CHICAGO BARRIER (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION).....	J-5
J.2.3	HAMMOND BARRIER (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, CAWS BUFFER ZONE, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN)	J-6
J.2.4	ALSIP BARRIER (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CSSC OPEN)	J-7
J.2.5	CALUMET CITY BARRIER (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION)	J-8
J.2.6	STICKNEY BARRIER (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN)	J-10
J.2.7	STATE LINE BARRIER (HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN, CAWS BUFFER ZONE)	J-11

FIGURES (CONT.)

J.3.1	NEW RESERVOIR AT OAK LAWN (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CSSC OPEN, FLOW BYPASS).....	J-13
J.3.2	NEW RESERVOIR AT STATE LINE (CAWS BUFFER ZONE, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN)	J-14
J.3.3	MCCOOK TUNNEL (FLOW BYPASS)	J-15
J.3.4	SECOND RESERVOIR AT MCCOOK (FLOW BYPASS).....	J-16
J.3.5	SECOND RESERVOIR AT MCCOOK – SIZING (FLOW BYPASS)	J-17
J.3.6	MCCOOK TUNNELS (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION)	J-18
J.3.7	SECOND RESERVOIR AT MCCOOK (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION)...	J-19
J.3.8	SECOND RESERVOIR AT MCCOOK – SIZING (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION).....	J-20
J.3.9	MCCOOK TUNNELS (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN)	J-21
J.3.10	SECOND RESERVOIR AT MCCOOK (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN).....	J-22
J.3.11	SECOND RESERVOIR AT MCCOOK – SIZING (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN)	J-23
J.3.12	THORNTON TUNNELS (FLOW BYPASS)	J-23
J.3.13	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON (FLOW BYPASS).....	J-25
J.3.14	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON – SIZING (FLOW BYPASS ALTERNATIVE)	J-26
J.3.15	THORNTON TUNNELS (CAWS BUFFER ZONE, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN)	J-26
J.3.16	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON (CAWS BUFFER ZONE, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN).....	J-28
J.3.17	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON – SIZING (CAWS BUFFER ZONE, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN).....	J-28
J.3.18	THORNTON TUNNELS (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION)	J-29
J.3.19	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION).....	J-30
J.3.20	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON – SIZING (LAKEFRONT HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION).....	J-31
J.3.21	THORNTON TUNNELS (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CSSC OPEN).....	J-32

FIGURES (CONT.)

J.3.22	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CSSC OPEN)	J-33
J.3.23	SECOND RESERVOIR AT THORNTON – SIZING (MID-SYSTEM HYDROLOGIC SEPARATION, HYBRID CSSC OPEN)	J-34
J.4.1	CHICAGO LOCK AND ELECTRIC BARRIER (CAWS BUFFER ZONE, HYBRID CSSC OPEN)	J-36
J.4.2	T.J. O'BRIEN LOCK AND ELECTRIC BARRIER (HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN, CAWS BUFFER ZONE).....	J-37
J.4.3	BRANDON ROAD LOCK AND ELECTRIC BARRIER (CAWS BUFFER ZONE, HYBRID CAL-SAG OPEN, HYBRID CSSC OPEN)	J-38
J.4.4	STICKNEY LOCK AND ELECTRIC BARRIER (FLOW BYPASS).....	J-39
J.4.5	ALSIP LOCK AND ELECTRIC BARRIER (FLOW BYPASS).....	J-40

J.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this appendix is to present the engineering analysis for the formation of Great Lakes Mississippi River Interbasin Study plans. Each alternative plan contains several project features, including physical barriers, electric barriers, reservoirs, tunnels, and others. For an explanation of how these features fit into each alternative, refer to the main report, Chapter 3.

J.1.1 Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this appendix is to: (1) describe design criteria, engineering methods, procedures, and assumptions that were used for site layout and perform preliminary design analysis of the alternatives; (2) present the methods used and calculations developed for quantities; (3) present the real estate requirements; (4) present criteria and requirements for utility interferences; and (5) discuss the engineering design analytical requirements for the next phase of the project.

J.1.2 Existing Survey Data

Disclaimer: While the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Chicago District has made a reasonable effort to ensure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, it should be explicitly noted that USACE makes no warranty, representation, or guarantee, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided herein. The USACE, its officers, agents, employees, or servants shall assume no liability of any nature for any errors, omissions, or inaccuracies in the information provided regardless of how caused. The USACE, its officers, agents, employees, or servants shall assume no liability for any decisions made or actions taken or not taken by the user of the maps and associated data in reliance upon any information or data furnished here. By using these maps and associated data, the user does so entirely at his or her own risk and explicitly acknowledges that he/she is aware of and agrees to be bound by this disclaimer and agrees not to present any claim or demand of any nature against the USACE, its officers, agents, employees, or servants in any forum whatsoever for any damages of any nature whatsoever that may result from or may be caused in any way by the use of the maps and associated data.

Local geographic information system (GIS) data was used for the design of hydro-separation sites and represents conditions existing at that time. The GIS data used includes 2-ft contours, real estate parcels, streets and highways, and streams and water bodies. The GIS data was provided by Tele Atlas North America, Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, Illinois Department of Transportation Bureau of Information Processing, Lake County GIS/Mapping Division, and other local organizations.

The horizontal coordinates reference the Illinois State Plane Coordinate System, East Zone, or the Indiana State Plane Coordinate System, West Zone, North American Datum of 1983, in U.S. feet. All elevations used reference the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 in U.S. feet.

Baseline utility information is available for the conceptual design of the separation structures and other measures for this study. At this level of design, preliminary utility coordination with utility companies was not performed to identify existing utilities in significant conflict with the proposed features. Existing utility information was pulled from GIS and any existing project information for the sites in question. Designs were reviewed for any major conflicts and adjusted accordingly, with more minor relocations and coordination to be performed later. A detailed survey of all existing utilities within and adjacent to the project sites will be required during the design phase for each alternative plan.

J.1.3 Figures and Mapping

All alternative plan figures are included in the main body of this report and are referenced accordingly in this appendix. Overview figures of the proposed sites are provided in this appendix. Detailed site plans are not included in this report for this level of design; figures should be considered conceptual, showing the general location and system of each feature rather than the exact layout.

J.2 HYDRO-SEPARATION BARRIERS


The sites detailed in this section were chosen using extensive hydraulic and hydrologic modeling of the Chicago Area Waterway System (CAWS). Several locations were chosen based on this analysis as the least disruptive locations to separate the waterways. These locations are used in both the hydro-separation and technology alternatives. For detailed analysis of this modeling process, refer to Appendix D, Hydrologic & Hydraulic Analyses.

J.2.1 Wilmette (IL) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)

The Wilmette Separation Barrier (Figure J.2.1) blocks the North Branch of the Chicago River adjacent to the existing Wilmette control structure. The new Wilmette control structure will be placed about 200 ft upstream of the existing control structure, which will remain in place. Modifying the existing control structures will require significant changes, such as an elevation increase to meet the hydrologic separation requirements. Access to the site will be from the property surrounding the existing closure structures, which is owned by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (MWRD). The existing parking and storage areas of the plant will be used as temporary staging and storage areas during construction. Close coordination will be required with MWRD to continue its operations during construction.

This feature will also require an aquatic nuisance species (ANS) treatment plant adjacent to the barrier, with a capacity of 200 MGD. The plant will be placed somewhere in the open land directly west of the existing control structure, with direct access via the existing access road to the control structure and Sheridan Road. Personnel and equipment will use this road to access the treatment plant for operation and waste disposal. An area of 0.9 acres is required for the plant, along with access and parking areas. Specific real estate will need to be identified for the plant during further design. Existing electric lines and other utilities for Wilmette control structure will be extended slightly for operation of the new plant.

See 3.10 in the main report for the entire Lakefront Hydrologic Separation Alternative layout.



**FIGURE J.2.1 Wilmette Barrier
(Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)**


J.2.2 Chicago (IL) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)

The Chicago barrier (Figure J.2.2) blocks the Chicago River in downtown Chicago, slightly west and upriver of the existing lock structure. This barrier will be placed slightly upstream of the existing Chicago Lock structure just west of the Michigan Avenue Bridge, so the existing lock structure can remain in operation for certain uses such as local recreational boat traffic. This location will allow recreational boats that currently dock near the Michigan Avenue Bridge to continue to travel out into Lake Michigan. The exact barrier location will be determined in final design, taking into consideration adjacent real estate. The major issues with construction will revolve around site access and limited construction space, as the barrier will be placed in the heavily trafficked downtown area. The permanent easement will include the area of the barrier and access for maintenance of the structure. During construction, the majority of the work will be performed from floating barges in the water. The final design will have to work around the extensive existing utilities, transportation, and structures in the surrounding downtown area, with minimal disruptions.

The barrier will require an ANS Treatment Plant east of the barrier, with a capacity of 450 MGD. The plant will be placed on the open land intended for use in a failed residential high-rise construction project, which is currently unused. This site is approximately 3,000 ft east of the proposed barrier at North Water Street and McClurg Court, so the water from the barrier will be piped to this location. The treatment plant itself will cover an area of 1.5 acres, along with an easement for access. The existing roads will be used for personnel and equipment to access the plant, for operation, and for waste disposal. Existing utilities in the area will be extended slightly to connect with the new treatment plant. The site was prepped for the

development, which fell through several years ago, so there may be connections in place. This will be determined during further design investigations. During further design, the exact placement and layout of the barrier and related features will be determined. It may be desirable to build a wider physical barrier across the river, which will allow for the placement of the ANS Treatment Plant on top of the barrier instead of piping the material to another location. This widening could also incorporate green space into the design, if desired by the City of Chicago and any potential sponsors. Open land is very limited in the downtown Chicago location and this project will provide a unique opportunity to create new open space in the area.

See Figure 3.10 in the main report for the entire Lakefront Hydrologic Separation layout.



**FIGURE J.2.2 Chicago Barrier
(Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)**

J.2.3 Hammond (IN) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation, CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)

The Hammond separation barrier (Figure J.2.3) blocks the Little Calumet River in Hammond, Indiana. USACE has built the existing Hart Ditch Structure in this location, 1,000 ft west of the Hart ditch confluence and 200 ft east of the Northcote Avenue Bridge. The existing structure is gabion construction with no gate. The new separation barrier will be constructed approximately 50 ft east of this existing structure on its lakeside.

The site has existing access off the adjacent Northcote Avenue and River Drive roadways. The area to the south is residential. The structure will be small enough to avoid inconveniencing these property owners during construction and maintenance. To the north of the site is the existing reservoir, along with riprap for slope protection and some open land. The open area to the north and south of the River will be used for staging and access. If additional staging/storage space is needed, the open land north of the reservoir owned by Cabela's, Inc. will be used.

See Figure 3.10 in the main report for the entire Lakefront Hydrologic Separation layout, Figure 3.6 in the main report for the entire CAWS Buffer Zone layout, and Figure 3.19 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open layout.




FIGURE J.2.3 Hammond Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation, CAWS Buffer Zone, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)

J.2.4 Alsip (IL) Separation Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC [Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal] Open Alternative)

This barrier location blocks the Cal-Sag Channel in Alsip, Illinois (Figure J.2.4). The barrier will be located just west of the existing Crawford Avenue/Pulaski Road Bridge over the channel, east of the I-294 Tollway Bridge. These existing bridges will remain intact without damage or major access changes. Access to the construction site will be via city property. The south bank provides clear access, while the north bank holds existing public utility structures. The barrier will tie into existing steep banks on each side of the canal, which is quite wide at this location. It is essential to locate the barrier to the west of the

existing outfall on the south bank next to the Crawford Avenue Bridge, which deposits water from Natalie Creek into the Cal-Sag.

An ANS water treatment plant will be built on the north bank of the river, to the east of the Crawford Avenue Bridge on currently vegetated land. The treatment plant will have a capacity of 450 MGD and cover an area of 3.6 acres, with access directly off Crawford Avenue/South Pulaski Road. Personnel and equipment will use this road access for operation and waste removal activities. Access to the 294 highway is directly east of this location. Access for the physical barrier will be via the south bank, along an existing pathway to the river. Modifications and improvements will be made to this pathway to serve as permanent access for the barrier. Utilities will be extended to the site of the ANS Treatment Plant on the north bank. The surrounding area is developed and should have most utilities in place.

See Figure 3.14 in the main report for the entire Mid-System Hydrologic Separation layout. Refer to 3.24 in the main report for the entire Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative layout.



FIGURE J.2.4 Alsip Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC Open)

J.2.5 Calumet City (IL) Separation Barrier (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)

The Calumet City separation barrier (Figure J.2.5) blocks the Grand Calumet River in Calumet City, Illinois. The new structure will be built into the existing bridge carrying the Bishop Ford Highway over the Grand Calumet River, or the bridge will be rebuilt to incorporate the barrier as a part of the project. To complete this combined project USACE will have to coordinate closely with the Illinois Department of Transportation on design requirements, schedule, traffic rerouting during construction, and other details. The land to the north and south of the river adjacent to the bridge is open, allowing easy construction access and convenient staging areas. If the combined bridge and barrier proves to be impractical for any reason, the barrier will be built in the water closely adjacent to the existing bridge.

An ANS Water Treatment plant will be built on 1.5 acres to the northeast of the barrier and adjacent to the existing T.J. O'Brien Lock and Dam, with a capacity of 450 MGD. Access to the plant will be available via an extension to the existing parking/access for the Lock. Personnel and equipment can use this access for plant operation and waste removal. Electricity and other utilities will be extended from the adjacent lock site to hook up to the new treatment plant.

See Figure 3.10 in the main report for the entire Lakefront Hydrologic Separation layout.



**FIGURE J.2.5 Calumet City Barrier
(Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)**

J.2.6 Stickney (IL) Separation Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)

The Stickney Separation barrier (Figure J.2.6) blocks the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal in Stickney, Illinois. The new structure will be built within the boundaries of the existing MWRD-owned Stickney Water Reclamation Plant along the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. The barrier will be slightly west of the existing Central Avenue Bridge. The canal is very wide at this location, but contains steep, high slopes, which is significant in terms of any tie-ins that may be required. There are existing components of the water treatment plant along the banks that must be avoided during active construction. Coordination with MWRD is vital to working on this site. Existing railroads run adjacent to the canal on both banks, so construction and access must avoid these rail lines.

Access will be from Cicero Avenue, using the private access roads to the north and south of the canal. These access roads run closer to the canal than the railroads, which will allow construction without interfering with railroad-owned land. These roads may need to be improved in order to be used as continual access for vehicles and equipment to operate and maintain the barrier and treatment plant. The preferred staging and storage area during construction is the land to the south of the canal, as it is currently open and undeveloped, with limited brush and trees. The ANS Treatment Plant will be built on this land as well. Permanent easements will be required for the treatment plant and access to plant and barrier. The treatment plant will have a capacity of 650 MGD and cover an area of 5.2 acres, along with an access easement along the adjacent roads. Utilities will be extended from the surrounding Stickney treatment plant to the new ANS Treatment Plant. If access and land availability become an issue at this site during further design, this will be a potential location to build the ANS treatment plan on top of a larger physical barrier instead of on adjacent land.

See Figure 3.14 in the main report for the entire Mid-System Hydrologic Separation layout. Refer to 3.18 D-2 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open layout.




FIGURE J.2.6 Stickney Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)

J.2.7 Oak Lawn (IL) Separation Barrier (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative, Flow Bypass Alternative)

The Oak Lawn barrier is a complement to the Alsip barrier. The new Oak Lawn structure will avert water transfer along the Thorn Creek tributary leading into the Cal-Sag channel near the Alsip barrier location. At this location, the creek is rerouted through several underground tunnels and pipes. The barrier will be placed in these pipes, which will be closed off with concrete.


See Figure 3.14 in the main report for the entire Mid-System Hydrologic Separation layout, 3.2 in the main report for the entire Flow Bypass layout, and 3.24 in the main report for the entire Hybrid CSSC Open layout.

J.2.8 State Line (IL/IN) Separation Barrier (Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative, CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative)

The State Line barrier (Figure J.2.7) blocks the Grand Calumet River at the border of Illinois and Indiana. The new State Line structure will avert transfer of water on the Grand Calumet River. The barrier will be approximately 40 ft across the river, just east of the Indiana Harbor Belt Railway crossing in Calumet City, Illinois, just west of the Indiana state border. Access to the barrier will be maintained via the

industrial land on the north and south banks of the River. Overflow water will be sent slightly upriver to the new reservoir constructed for State Line barrier. See the Mitigation Design section for reservoir details.

See 3.19 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open layout. Refer to 3.6 in the main report for the entire CAWS Buffer Zone layout.



**FIGURE J.2.7 State Line Barrier
(Hybrid Cal-Sag Open, CAWS Buffer Zone)**

J.3 MITIGATION DESIGN

Several of the proposed hydrologic separation barrier locations require mitigation under Flood Risk Management for the flooding they will induce. Additional mitigation is required to avoid water quality degradation to the waterways. The mitigation proposed includes reservoirs and tunnel systems, with similarities to the Tunnel and Reservoir Project (TARP) currently being constructed in the Chicago area. Specifically, the construction of the underground tunnels is assumed to mimic the construction of the TARP system tunnels, constructed by MWRD. The hydraulic engineering group determined the reservoir sizes, general locations, and tunnel locations during modeling. Refer to Appendix D for more information on the modeling performed.

J.3.1 New Reservoir at Oak Lawn (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative, Flow Bypass Alternative)

The Oak Lawn barrier along Thorn Creek requires a reservoir adjacent to the barrier, referred to as the Oak Lawn reservoir (Figure J.3.1). Based on the placement of the barrier in the system, the reservoir must hold 530 acre-ft of water (0.2 Billion Gallons). This reservoir will be a dike system, placed in the open area at 115th Street and Cicero Avenue in Oak Lawn, Illinois. Access is available directly off these roads. This area is currently open land owned by the adjacent cemetery. Only open land will be used for the reservoir, and no existing structures at the cemetery will be disturbed. The reservoir will be surrounded by approximately 10-ft-tall berms with a 3:1 slope, for a reservoir covering an area of 80 acres. This 10-ft height can be achieved with a combination of excavating existing soil and building up new berms. It will incorporate the existing ponds on site, and expand these into a much larger reservoir. The planned reservoir has berms with top elevation 598 ft, only slightly higher than the existing site elevations. The reservoir base is at 588 ft, the bottom elevation of the existing ponds. Incorporating 2 ft of freeboard, the maximum water elevation will be 596 ft, for a storage capacity of approximately 597 acre-ft. Further design would modify and optimize the design. The two ponds on site will be incorporated into the reservoir design.

As currently shown, the reservoir will require approximately 850,000 CY of material be disposed. InRoads reports created for this design can be seen in Enclosure C. If some or all of the on-site material is found through further soil investigations to be unsuitable for berm construction, outside clay will be brought in. The reservoir will then be redesigned to allow for more fill and minimal cut. Thorn Creek briefly flows through underground tunnels here, before daylighting again farther downstream. This reservoir connection will be just upstream of the Oak Lawn barrier. The connection of the reservoir to Thorn Creek is through a drop shaft and pipe connection to the tunnel system at that location, from which the water will be pumped into the reservoir. Water will also need to be pumped out of the reservoir when storage is no longer required. This pump station will be added in further study and design of the site. The surrounding area is highly developed and mainly residential, so electricity will simply need to be extended onto the site.

Further design of this reservoir should investigate soil properties in the area, and verify the real estate can reasonably be acquired. The design was performed using existing topography and the InRoads program. Storage volumes were calculated with the pond volume tool, and overall cut and fill were calculated using a triangle comparison of the existing and designed surfaces.

See Section 3.15 in the main report for the entire Mid-System Hydrologic Separation mitigation layout, Section 3.25 in the main report for the entire Hybrid CSSC Open mitigation layout, and Section 3.3 in the main report for the entire Flow Bypass mitigation layout.



FIGURE J.3.1 New Reservoir at Oak Lawn (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC Open, Flow Bypass)

J.3.2 New Reservoir at State Line (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)

The State Line barrier requires overflow water to be piped from the barrier to a newly constructed reservoir referred to as State Line reservoir (Figure J.3.2). The reservoir will be located on the land south of the intersection of Brainard Avenue and Burnham Avenue. Access is available directly off these roads. The property is currently being used as a golf course and will need to be transferred to the government. The site is adjacent to the Grand Calumet River so the water could be directed into the reservoir via a spillway or weir, or a pump station if necessary. Further analysis will determine the inflow/outflow required.

The reservoir will be surrounded by approximately 14-ft-tall berms with a 3:1 slope, for a reservoir covering an area of 110 acres and holding the required capacity of 921 acre-ft, or 0.3 billion gallons. The 14-ft height can be achieved with a combination of excavating existing soil and building up new berms. The planned reservoir has berms with a top elevation of 594 ft, slightly higher than the existing site elevations. The reservoir interior base is at 580 ft, and the exterior base elevation varies, meeting up with the existing site elevations. Incorporating 2 ft of freeboard, the maximum water elevation will be 592 ft, for a storage capacity of approximately 990 acre-ft. Further design would modify and optimize the design.

As currently designed, the reservoir will require approximately 430,000 CY of material be disposed. InRoads reports created for this design can be seen in Enclosure C. If some or all of the on-site material is found through further soil investigations to be unsuitable for berm construction, outside clay will be brought in. The reservoir will then be redesigned to allow for optimization of cut and fill.

Further design of this reservoir should investigate soil properties in the area, and verify that the real estate can be reasonably acquired. Final design will address further reservoir requirements such as permanent interior drainage, weir or pump station, and others.

See Section 3.7 in the main report for the entire CAWS Buffer Zone mitigation layout. Refer to Section 3.20 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open mitigation layout.



**FIGURE J.3.2 New Reservoir at State Line
(CAWS Buffer Zone, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)**

J.3.3 Second Reservoir at McCook (Flow Bypass Alternative)

J.3.3.1 Tunnel System

The Stickney Lock and Electric Barrier require a conveyance tunnel to bring overflow water from the lock to a newly constructed reservoir at McCook reservoir (Figure J.3.3). The tunnel will run a distance of 4.9 miles with a 14-ft diameter. Creation of the tunnel will require disposal of 147,500 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within the public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.



FIGURE J.3.3 McCook Tunnel (Flow Bypass)

J.3.3.2 Reservoir

This reservoir is assumed to be placed near the existing McCook reservoir (Figure J.3.4), either in the existing quarry or in a newly blasted area adjacent to it. The existing quarry belongs to private company, Vulcan Materials Company, and can be accessed from Joliet Road in Joliet, Illinois. The Stickney Reservoir must hold a minimum of 11.4 billion gallons, or 35,000 acre-ft. A reservoir of this size requires significant real estate and/or deep excavation and is a major construction project. A comparison can be made to the existing construction project McCook reservoir, which holds 10 billion gallons compared to this reservoir's 11.4 billion. Using a similar depth to McCook of 292 ft, the site requires 120 acres for the reservoir alone. This will result in an approximately 2,000-ft-wide by 2,614-ft-long reservoir on the proposed site. See Figure J.3.5 for a full analysis of footprint vs. excavation options and Enclosure B for further calculations.

Some additional real estate will be required for construction staging and access, permanent easements around the reservoir site, interior drainage, pump stations, and other incidental features. These features will not be designed until further in the study or design work, when specific real estate is identified for the project. This additional real estate will also account for the final design variations of the reservoir, which will include some ramps and other features that will slightly increase the reservoir area to accommodate the required storage.

No large-scale mining and disposal of rock will be needed based on the use of the existing quarry, which is the ideal design option. If the existing quarry is not available or not large enough, additional stone will be excavated to create the reservoir and the stone will require disposal. Reservoir design assumptions were based on the existing Thornton and McCook reservoir projects.

See 3.3 in the main report for the entire Flow Bypass mitigation layout.



**FIGURE J.3.4 Second Reservoir at McCook
(Flow Bypass)**




FIGURE J.3.5 Second Reservoir at McCook – Sizing (Flow Bypass)

J.3.4 Second Reservoir at McCook (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)

J.3.4.1 Tunnel System

The Chicago and Wilmette barriers require a storage reservoir for Flood Risk Management mitigation at McCook. This reservoir is combined with a system of conveyance tunnels. A tunnel extends from the Wilmette barrier to the Chicago barrier for a total of 13.1 miles with a 22-ft diameter. A second tunnel extends from the Chicago barrier to the McCook reservoir expansion location for a distance of 12.5 miles with a 42-ft diameter (Figure J.3.6). Creation of the Wilmette to Chicago tunnel will require disposal of 973,818 CY of material and creation of the Chicago to McCook tunnel will require disposal of 3,386,645 CY of material. See Enclosure B for calculations. The new reservoir is then assumed to be located at the McCook reservoir expansion site. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed adjacent to the existing TARP tunnels along the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal and the North Branch of the Chicago River, within MRWD and public right-of-ways as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD TARP tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.




FIGURE J.3.6 McCook Tunnels (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)

J.3.4.2 Reservoir


The Chicago and Wilmette Barrier locations collectively require a reservoir of 20,000 acre-ft, or 6.5 billion gallons, to meet Flood Risk Management requirements (Figure J.3.7). This reservoir is assumed to be placed near the McCook reservoir, either in the existing quarry or in a newly blasted area adjacent to it. The existing quarry belongs to private company, Vulcan Materials Company, and can be accessed from Joliet Road in Joliet, Illinois. Possible sizing options for the new reservoir are shown in Figure J.3.8. For further calculations see Enclosure B. Using the McCook depth of 286 ft, the site requires 70 acres for the reservoir alone, with 80 acres assumed for the overall site. This will result in a 1,000-ft-wide by 3,050-ft-long reservoir on the proposed site.

Some additional real estate will be required for construction staging and access, permanent easements around the reservoir site, interior drainage, pump stations, and other incidental features. These features will not be designed until further in the study or design work, when specific real estate is identified for the project. This additional real estate will also account for the final design variations of the reservoir, which will include some ramps and other features that will slightly increase the reservoir area to accommodate the required storage. No large-scale mining and disposal of rock will be needed based on the use of the existing quarry, which is the ideal design option. If the existing quarry is not available or not large enough, additional stone will be excavated to create the reservoir and the stone excavated will require disposal. Reservoir design assumptions were based on the existing McCook reservoir project.

See Section 3.11 in the main report for the entire Lakefront Hydrologic Separation mitigation layout.



**FIGURE J.3.7 Second Reservoir at McCook
(Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)**



**FIGURE J.3.8 Second Reservoir at McCook – Sizing
(Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)**

J.3.5 Second Reservoir at McCook (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)

J.3.5.1 Tunnel System

A new reservoir is required at the McCook site to contain combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and maintain water quality in the basin (Figure J.3.9). The tunnel will run a distance of 12.5 miles with a 32-ft diameter, starting at Lawrence Avenue and running along the North Branch of the Chicago River and channel to the McCook reservoir. Creation of the Lawrence to McCook tunnel will require disposal of 1,965,950 CY of material. See Enclosure B for calculations. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.

A secondary tunnel will run from the Wilmette Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) to downstream of the Stickney barrier. This will divert the WRP outfalls out of the Great Lakes basin. The tunnel will run a distance of 12.5 miles with a 13-ft diameter. Creation of the Wilmette to Stickney tunnel will require disposal of 324,500 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.




FIGURE J.3.9 McCook Tunnels (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)

J.3.5.2 Reservoir

The reservoir (Figure J.3.10) is assumed to be constructed at the previously mined McCook quarry. The existing quarry belongs to Vulcan Materials Company and can be accessed from Joliet Road in Joliet, Illinois. The reservoir must hold a minimum of 8.1 billion gallons, or 25,000 acre-ft. A reservoir of this size requires significant real estate and/or deep excavation and is a major construction project. A comparison can be made to the existing construction project McCook reservoir, which holds 10 billion gallons compared to this reservoir's 8.1 billion. Using a 250-ft depth, which is shallower than the depth of the existing reservoir, the site requires 100 acres for the reservoir alone. This will result in an approximately 2,000-ft-wide by 2,180-ft-long reservoir on the proposed site. See Figure J.3.11 for a full analysis of footprint vs. excavation options and Enclosure B for further calculations.

Some additional real estate will be required for construction staging and access, permanent easements around the reservoir site, interior drainage, pump stations, and other incidental features. The assumed total permanent easement is 115 acres. These features will not be designed until further in the study or design work, when specific real estate is identified for the project. This additional real estate will also account for the final design variations of the reservoir, which will include some ramps and other features that will slightly increase the reservoir area to accommodate the required storage.

No large-scale mining and disposal of rock will be needed based on the use of the existing quarry, which is the ideal design option. If the existing quarry is not available or not large enough, additional stone will be excavated to create the reservoir and the stone excavated will require disposal. Reservoir design assumptions were based on the existing McCook and Thornton reservoir projects.

See 3.15 in the main report for the entire Mid-System Hydrologic Separation mitigation layout. Refer to 3.20 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open mitigation layout.



FIGURE J.3.10 Second Reservoir at McCook (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)




FIGURE J.3.11 Second Reservoir at McCook – Sizing (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)

J.3.6 Second Reservoir at Thornton (Flow Bypass Alternative)

J.3.6.1 Tunnel System

The Alsip Lock and Electric Barrier require a conveyance tunnel to bring overflow water from the lock to a newly constructed reservoir at Thornton (Figure J.3.12). The tunnel will run a distance of 5.0 miles with a 16-ft diameter. Creation of the tunnel will require disposal of 196,600 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.




FIGURE J.3.12 Thornton Tunnels (Flow Bypass)

J.3.6.2 Reservoir

The reservoir (Figure J.3.13) will be constructed at one of the Thornton quarry locations owned by Hanson Material Service to address flooding impacts on the Calumet, Little Calumet, and Grand Calumet rivers. These quarries are located in Thornton, Illinois, with access off of Interstate I-80 and Williams Street. The Hammond reservoir must hold a minimum of 15.8 billion gallons, or 48,500 acre-ft. The reservoir could be placed on either of the existing quarries south of I-80, or in a combination of both quarries, connected via culverts. One of these quarries is currently holding a limited quantity of water as the Thornton transition reservoir, and the other is still being quarried. The proposed reservoir will have a depth of 285 ft, and an area of approximately 2,000 ft by 3,703 ft. See Figure J.3.14 for a full analysis of footprint vs. excavation options and Enclosure B for further calculations.

The proposed reservoir area requires 170 acres, with a total permanent easement area of approximately 190 acres. Some of this additional real estate will be required for construction staging and access, permanent easements around the reservoir site, interior drainage, pump stations, and other incidental features. These features will not be designed until further in the study or design work, when specific real estate is identified for the project. This additional real estate will also account for the final design variations of the reservoir, which will include some ramps and other features that will slightly increase the reservoir area to accommodate the required storage.

No large-scale mining and disposal of rock will be needed based on the use of the existing quarry, which is the ideal design option. If the existing quarry is not available or not large enough, additional stone will be excavated to create the reservoir and the stone excavated will require disposal. Reservoir design assumptions were based on the existing Thornton and McCook reservoir projects.

Refer to Section 3.3 in the main report for the entire Flow Bypass mitigation layout.



FIGURE J.3.13 Second Reservoir at Thornton (Flow Bypass)




FIGURE J.3.14 Second Reservoir at Thornton – Sizing (Flow Bypass Alternative)

J.3.7 Second Reservoir at Thornton (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative)

J.3.7.1 Tunnel System

A new reservoir is required at Thornton to contain CSO overflows and maintain water quality in the basin due to the barrier at Hammond. A potential variation in this alternative includes the storage required for the State Line barrier in this reservoir, increasing the capacity and adding a tunnel from the barrier to the reservoir (Figure J.3.15). The tunnel to collect water from the Little Calumet River will run a distance of 7.2 miles from Hammond to Thornton, with a 14-ft diameter. Creation of the Hammond to Thornton tunnel will require disposal of 216,745 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.




FIGURE J.3.15 Thornton Tunnels (CAWS Buffer Zone, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These

assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.

If this reservoir is used to hold the overflow water from the State Line barrier, a second tunnel will run from the State Line reservoir to the Thornton reservoir. This will divert overflow water from the Grand Calumet River and avert Flood Risk Management impacts. The tunnel will run a distance of approximately 7 miles from State Line to Thornton. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size. Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.

J.3.7.2 Reservoir

The Thornton reservoir (Figure J.3.16) is assumed to be constructed at one of the Thornton quarry locations owned by Hanson Material Service. These quarries are located in Thornton, Illinois, with access off Interstate I-80 and Williams Street. The Hammond/State Line reservoir must hold a minimum of 4.4 billion gallons, or 13,500 acre-ft. If the State Line reservoir is not used as a feature in this alternative, 14,500 acre-ft of storage will be required. The reservoir will need to be increased in depth and/or area to accommodate this extra capacity. The reservoir could be placed on either of the existing quarries south of I-80, or in a combination of both quarries, connected via culverts. One of these quarries is currently holding a limited quantity of water as the Thornton transition reservoir, and the other is still being quarried. The proposed reservoir will have a depth of 135 ft, and an area of approximately 2,000 ft × 2,200 ft. See Figure J.3.17 for a full analysis of footprint vs. excavation options and Enclosure B for further calculations.


The proposed reservoir area requires 100 acres, with a total permanent easement area of approximately 115 acres. Some of this additional real estate will be required for construction staging and access, permanent easements around the reservoir site, interior drainage, pump stations, and other incidental features. These features will not be designed until further along in the study or design when specific real estate is identified for the project. This additional real estate will also account for the final design variations of the reservoir, which will include some ramps and other features that will slightly increase the reservoir area to accommodate the required storage.

No large-scale mining and disposal of rock will be needed based on the use of the existing quarry, which is the ideal design option. If the existing quarry is not available or not large enough, additional stone will be excavated to create the reservoir and the stone excavated will require disposal. Reservoir design assumptions were based on the existing McCook and Thornton reservoir projects.

See 3.7 in the main report for the entire CAWS Buffer Zone mitigation layout. Refer to 3.20 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open mitigation layout.



**FIGURE J.3.16 Second Reservoir at Thornton
(CAWS Buffer Zone, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)**



**FIGURE J.3.17 Second Reservoir at Thornton - Sizing
(CAWS Buffer Zone, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open)**

J.3.8 Second Reservoir at Thornton (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)

J.3.8.1 Tunnel System

The Calumet City barrier location requires a reservoir of 41,430 acre-ft, or 13.5 billion gallons, at Thornton to meet Flood Risk Management requirements. The reservoir uses a conveyance tunnel (Figure J.3.18) from the Calumet City barrier location to the Thornton reservoir location, where it is assumed the new reservoir will be located. The conveyance tunnel will run a distance of 5.5 miles with a 30-ft diameter. Creation of the tunnel will require disposal of 760,270 CY of material. See Enclosure B for calculations. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.

The tunnel to collect water from the Little Calumet River will run a distance of 7.2 miles from Hammond to Thornton with a 14-ft diameter. Creation of the Hammond to Thornton tunnel will require disposal of 216,745 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.




FIGURE J.3.18 Thornton Tunnels (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)

J.3.8.2 Reservoir

The reservoir (Figure J.3.19) could be placed on either of the existing quarries south of I-80 owned by Hanson Material Service. These quarries are located in Thornton, Illinois, with access off of Interstate I-80 and Williams Street. One of these quarries is currently holding a limited quantity of water as the Thornton transition reservoir, and the other is still being quarried. This reservoir will need to hold a storage capacity of 41,430 acre-ft (13.5 Billion Gallons). A reservoir of this size requires significant real estate and/or deep excavation and is a major construction project. A comparison can be made to the existing construction project McCook reservoir, which holds 10 billion gallons compared with this reservoir's 13.5 billion. Using a similar depth to McCook of 296 ft, the site requires 140 acres for the reservoir alone, which will be 2,400 ft wide by 2,550 ft. See Figure J.3.20 for a full analysis of footprint vs. excavation options and Enclosure B for further calculations.


Some additional real estate will be required for construction staging and access, permanent easements around the reservoir site, interior drainage, pump stations, and other incidental features. These features will not be designed until further along in the study or design work when specific real estate is identified for the project. This additional real estate will also account for the final design variations of the reservoir, which will include some ramps and other features that will slightly increase the reservoir area to accommodate the required storage.

No large-scale mining and disposal of rock will be needed based on the use of the existing quarry. If the existing quarry cannot be used, extensive mining and rock disposal will be required to construct the reservoir. Reservoir design assumptions were based on the existing Thornton reservoir project.

Refer to 3.11 in the main report for the entire Lakefront Hydrologic Separation mitigation layout.



**FIGURE J.3.19 Second Reservoir at Thornton
(Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)**



**FIGURE J.3.20 Second Reservoir at Thornton – Sizing
(Lakefront Hydrologic Separation)**

J.3.9 Second Reservoir at Thornton (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative)

J.3.9.1 Tunnel System

A new reservoir is required at Thornton to contain CSO overflows and maintain water quality in the basin. The tunnel (Figure J.3.21) will run a distance of 5.5 miles from Hammond to Thornton with a 30-ft diameter. Creation of the Hammond to Thornton tunnel will require disposal of 760,267 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.

A second tunnel will run from the Calumet Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) to downstream of the Alsip Barrier. This will divert the WRP outfalls out of the Great Lakes basin to the Mississippi River side. The tunnel will run a distance of 5.3 miles from Calumet to Alsip with a 13-ft diameter. Creation of the Calumet to Alsip tunnel will require disposal of 137,500 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size.

Tunnel design and construction is based on the existing tunnels of the TARP system. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These

assumptions are based on the MWRD tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project.

A third tunnel will run from the Calumet Water Reclamation Plant to Thornton reservoir, to remove water from the Thornton reservoir for treatment. Based on the TARP tunnels, which are similar in capacity, the proposed tunnel will run a distance of 5.8 miles with a 30-ft diameter. Creation of the Thornton to Calumet tunnel will require disposal of 732,650 CY of material. It is assumed that the tunnel will be placed within public right-of-way as much as possible. Further design and investigation will be needed to determine the extent of underground conflicts; some relocations are to be expected for a tunneling project this size. Tunnel shafts will also need to be placed approximately every 3,000 ft along the length of the tunnel. These will require a minimal 0.2-acre easement, which will also be placed in public right-of-way locations. The exact locations will be determined in further design based on available property in the required locations. These assumptions are based on the existing TARP tunnels and the Calumet Tunnel System designed as a part of the Little Calumet River flood damage reduction project. Additional hydraulic analysis is needed on this tunnel to confirm the placement and sizing will be sufficient for this design.




FIGURE J.3.21 Thornton Tunnels (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC Open)

J.3.9.2 Reservoir

The reservoir (Figure J.3.22) is assumed to be constructed at one of the Thornton quarry locations owned by Hanson Material Service. These quarries are located in Thornton, Illinois, with access off of Interstate I-80 and Williams St. The Hammond reservoir must hold a minimum of 5.2 billion gallons, or 16,000 acre-ft. The reservoir could be placed on either of the existing quarries south of I-80, or in a combination of both quarries, connected via culverts. One of these quarries is currently holding a limited quantity of water as the Thornton transition reservoir, and the other is still being quarried. The proposed reservoir will have a depth of 200 ft, and an area of approximately 2,000 ft × 1,742 ft. See Figure J.3.23 for a full analysis of footprint vs. excavation options and Enclosure B for further calculations.

The proposed reservoir area requires 80 acres, with a total permanent easement area of approximately 90 acres. Some of this additional real estate will be required for construction staging and access, permanent easements around the reservoir site, interior drainage, pump stations, and other incidental

features. These features will not be designed until further along in the study or design work when specific real estate is identified for the project. This additional real estate will also account for the final design variations of the reservoir, which will include some ramps and other features that will slightly increase the reservoir area to accommodate the required storage.

No large-scale mining and disposal of rock will be needed based on the use of the existing quarry, which is the ideal design option. If the existing quarry is not available or not large enough, additional stone will be excavated to create the reservoir and the stone excavated will require disposal. Reservoir design assumptions were based on the existing McCook and Thornton reservoir projects.

See 3.15 in the main report for the entire Mid-System Hydrologic Separation mitigation layout. Refer to 3.25 in the main report for the entire Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative mitigation layout.





FIGURE J.3.22 Second Reservoir at Thornton (Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC Open)



**FIGURE J.3.23 Second Reservoir at Thornton – Sizing
(Mid-System Hydrologic Separation, Hybrid CSSC Open)**

J.4 TECHNOLOGY FEATURES

The sites detailed in this selection were chosen using extensive hydraulic and hydrologic modeling of the CAWS. Several locations were chosen based on this analysis as the most effective locations to place project features. For detailed analysis of this modeling process, refer to Appendix D, Hydrologic & Hydraulic Analyses.


J.4.1 Chicago (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative)

The existing Chicago Lock will be modified, and a new lock chamber added with an electric barrier (Figure J.4.1). No new real estate is required for the lock because the existing area is federal property. There will be an ANS Treatment Plant required with a capacity of 1,750 MGD, which will be built on newly created land between the old and new lock structures with a footprint of 5.7 acres. This area will also provide a location for the electric lock building. Existing utilities for the Chicago Lock will be used to operate the new features, with additional capacity added if necessary.

The new lock structure is proposed to be built on a slight southwestern angle, origination just south of the existing lock barrier. This will provide a larger open, queuing area for boats entering and leaving the lock. This will also keep the electric barrier farther away from the Navy Pier area to the north of the existing lock, which supports heavy recreational activity.

The new lock will be significantly longer than the current structure, with two separate lock closures. The more frequently used lock closure will be shallow, with a depth of no more than 10 to 15 ft for the majority of shall draft vessels that use the Chicago lock. For the small number of larger vessels that use the lock, a second parallel lock will be built deep enough to allow their passage. The extended length will provide a safety zone on either side of the electric barrier for additional safety. Full safety provisions will be determined in further design, with the input of all stakeholders particularly the U.S. Coast Guard. Further design will also allow for a redesign of the current breakwater structure to provide a direct entrance to the new lock, while providing wave protection to avoid the transfer of Lake Michigan water over the lock structures.

See Section 3.6 in the main report for the CAWS Buffer Zone layout. Refer to 3.24 in the main report for the Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative layout.




**FIGURE J.4.1 Chicago Lock and Electric Barrier
(CAWS Buffer Zone, Hybrid CSSC Open)**

J.4.2 T.J. O'Brien (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative, CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative)

A new GLMRIS Lock is planned at T.J. O'Brien Lock with an electric barrier (Figure J.4.2). An ANS water treatment plant will be required in conjunction with the barrier, with a capacity of 1,280 MGD. The plant will have a footprint of 4.1 acres and will be placed on the open land adjacent to the lock, to be accessed via the existing roadway and parking area. Existing utilities for the T.J. O'Brien Lock and Dam will be used for the new structures, with additional capacity added if necessary. The existing controlling works structure will be removed and replaced with a new, larger, screened controlling works structure. These additions will all be built in the water with limited real estate requirements to allow for tie in and access on the east bank. See the Structural Appendix for details of the modifications required at T.J. O'Brien.

See Section 3.19 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open layout. Refer to Section 3.6 in the main report for the entire CAWS Buffer Zone layout.



**FIGURE J.4.2 T.J. O'Brien Lock and Electric Barrier
(Hybrid Cal-Sag Open, CAWS Buffer Zone)**

J.4.3 Brandon Road (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative)

The existing Brandon Road Lock structure will be modified to include an electric barrier (Figure J.4.3). Modifications will be confined to the waterway and within the existing lock property. An operating building for the barrier will be constructed on the open land to the north of the lock. Existing utilities for Brandon Road Lock will be used for the new electric barrier and its associated operation, with additional capacity added if necessary.

See Section 3.6 in the main report for the entire CAWS Buffer Zone layout, Section 3.19 in the main report for the entire Hybrid Cal-Sag Open layout, and Section 3.24 in the main report for the entire Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative layout.




FIGURE J.4.3 Brandon Road Lock and Electric Barrier (CAWS Buffer Zone, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open, Hybrid CSSC Open)

J.4.4 Stickney (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (Flow Bypass Alternative)

A new lock structure with electric barrier will be constructed in the waterway at the Stickney site (Figure J.4.4) . A new lock and barrier building will be built adjacent on the south bank, along with an ANS Treatment Plant for lockages. The ANS Treatment Plant will have a footprint of 5.6 acres and a capacity of 700 MGD. Electric power, along with other utilities needed for the ANS Treatment Plant, will need to be extended to this site.

See 3.2 in the main report for the entire Flow Bypass layout.




FIGURE J.4.4 Stickney Lock and Electric Barrier (Flow Bypass)

J.4.5 Alsip (IL) Lock and Electric Barrier (Flow Bypass Alternative)

A new lock structure with electric barrier will be constructed in the waterway at the Alsip site (Figure J.4.5). A new lock and barrier building will be constructed on the adjacent banks, along with an ANS Treatment Plant for lockages. The ANS Treatment Plant will have a footprint of 7.2 acres with a capacity of 900 MGD, and the new lock and barrier building will have a footprint of approximately 1.5 acres. Electric power, along with other utilities needed for the ANS Treatment Plant, will need to be extended to this site.

See Section 3.2 in the main report for the entire Flow Bypass layout.



FIGURE J.4.5 Alsip Lock and Electric Barrier (Flow Bypass)

J.5 REAL ESTATE

As identified earlier in this report, specific real estate has not been identified or acquired for these alternatives at this point in design. The team has identified that real estate is potentially available in the areas the features have been placed, with some level of variation deemed acceptable as to the final parcels chosen. Approximate sizes and types of easements were developed based on the alternative features, and areas identified where these easements could be placed. Specific factors used to identify these areas are included in the individual feature descriptions.

Temporary staging areas were included in the estimates, as well as permanent access easements for operation and maintenance of facilities. Because only conceptual levels of designs are available for the features at this point, estimates of the required real estate are conservative. This should allow for variations in the further design and the additional features included in this further design, such as parking lots, interior drainage, pump stations, utility extensions, and many more. Further design on any alternatives would also include research into available real estate and communication with parcel owners.

Refer to Enclosure A for a summary of the real estate areas identified. Full detail on the study's real estate is available in Appendix L.

ENCLOSURE A
REAL ESTATE SUMMARY

Mid-System Control Technologies without a Buffer Zone - "Flow Bypass Alternative"	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Stickney (IL)	GLRMIS lock	10.5	Navigational Servitude	2.2
	Lock and Electric Barrier Building	2.8	Fee Simple	2.1
	ANS Treatment Plant	9.1	Fee Simple	
	Conveyance Tunnel	16.0	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at McCook	140	Fee Simple	10
Alsip (IL)	GLRMIS lock	12.3	Navigational Servitude	1.7
	Lock and Electric Barrier Building	2.2	Fee Simple	
	ANS Treatment Plant	9.9	Fee Simple	1
	Conveyance Tunnel	17.5	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at Thornton	190	Fee Simple	10
	New Reservoir at Oak Lawn	90	Fee Simple	12
Technology Alternative with a Buffer Zone - "CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative"	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Wilmette (IL)	Rehab existing control structure	0.2		0.8
	ANS Treatment Plant	1.3	Fee Simple	
Chicago (IL)	Lock with electric barrier	12	Navigational Servitude	3.4
	ANS Treatment plant for lock structure		Fee Simple	
	ANS treatment plant for diversion		Fee Simple	
TJ O'Brien (IN)	Lock with electric barrier	10	Navigational Servitude	3.4
	ANS Treatment plans for lock structure	7.5	Fee Simple	1.75
	ANS Treatment Plant for diversion		Fee Simple	
State Line (IL/IN)	Physical barrier	0.03	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	0.5	Fee Simple	1.2
	New Reservoir at State Line	130	Fee Simple	10

Technology Alternative with a Buffer Zone - "CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative" (Cont.)	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Hammond (IN)	Physical barrier	0.05	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	0.2	Fee Simple	1
	Conveyance Tunnel	23.5	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at Thornton	115	Fee Simple	10
Brandon Road (IL)	Lock with electric barrier	10.5	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier building	3	Fee simple	3.6
Lakefront Hydrologic Separation	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Wilmette (IL)	Physical Barrier	0.05	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	0.4	Fee Simple	0.9
	ANS Treatment Plant	0.9	Fee Simple	
	Conveyance Tunnel	55.4	Utility Easement	
Chicago (IL)	Physical Barrier	0.1	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	0.5	Fee Simple	0.5
	ANS Treatment Plant	3.2	Fee Simple	1.4
	Conveyance Tunnel	83.2	Tunnel Easement	
	Second Reservoir at McCook	80	Fee Simple	10
	Small Boat Rec Harbor	30	Navigational Servitude	
	Rec Harbor Land area	5	Fee Simple	1
Calumet City (IL)	Physical Barrier	0.15	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	2	Fee Simple	1.5
	ANS Treatment Plant	3.3	Fee Simple	1
	Conveyance Tunnel	28.6	Utility Easement	

Lakefront Hydrologic Separation (Cont.)	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Hammond (IN)	Physical Barrier	0.05	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	0.2	Fee Simple	1
	Conveyance Tunnel	22.8	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at Thornton	160	Fee Simple	10
Mid-System Hydrologic Separation	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Stickney (IL)	Physical Barrier	0.1	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier	2	Fee Simple	1.4
	ANS Treatment Plant	10	Fee Simple	
Alsip (IL)	Physical Barrier	0.2	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	1.6	Fee Simple	0.5
	ANS Treatment Plant	5.3	Fee Simple	1
	New Reservoir at Oak Lawn	90	Fee Simple	12
Water Quality features	Conveyance Tunnel (Lawrence To McCook)	68.0	Utility Easement	
	WRP Conveyance Tunnel (Wilmette to Stickney)	39.2	Utility Easement	
	Conveyance Tunnel (Hammond to Thornton)	28.6	Utility Easement	
	Conveyance Tunnel (Calumet to Thornton)	27.6	Utility Easement	
	WRP Conveyance Tunnel (Calumet to Alsip)	16.6	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at McCook	110	Fee Simple	10
	Second Reservoir at Thornton	90	Fee Simple	10

Mid-System Separation Cal-Sag Open Control Technologies with a Buffer Zone - "Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative"	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Stickney (IL)	Physical barrier	0.1	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	2	Fee Simple	1.4
	ANS Treatment Plant	10	Fee Simple	
TJ O'Brien (IN)	Lock with electric barrier	10	Navigational Servitude	3.4
	ANS Treatment Plant for lock structure	7.5	Fee Simple	1.75
	ANS treatment plans for diversion		Fee Simple	
State Line (IL/IN)	Physical barrier	0.03	Navigational Servitude	
	Barrier land	0.5	Fee Simple	1.2
	New Reservoir at State Line	130	Fee Simple	10
Hammond (IN)	Physical Barrier	0.05	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier land	0.2	Fee Simple	1
	Conveyance Tunnel	23.5	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at Thornton	115	Fee Simple	10
Brandon Road (IL)	New lock structure w/ electric barrier	10.5	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier building	3	Fee Simple	3.6
Water Quality features	Conveyance Tunnel (Lawrence to McCook)	68.0	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at McCook	110	Fee Simple	10
	Conveyance Tunnel (Wilmette to Stickney)	39.2	Utility Easement	

Mid-System Separation CSSC Open Control Technologies with a Buffer Zone - "Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative"	Feature	Perm Estate Size (acres)	Permanent Estate Type	Associated Temporary Easement (acres)
Wilmette (IL)	Rehab existing control structure	0.2		0.8
	ANS Treatment Plant	1.3	Fee Simple	
Chicago (IL)	New lock structure w/ electric barrier	13.2	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Treatment plant for barrier	12	Fee Simple	
	ANS Treatment Plant for diversion		Fee Simple	
Alsip (IL)	Physical barrier	0.2	Navigational Servitude	
	Barrier land	1.6	Fee Simple	0.5
	ANS Treatment Plant	5.3	Fee Simple	1
	New Reservoir at Oak Lawn	90	Fee Simple	12
Brandon Rd (IL)	New lock structure w/ electric barrier	10.5	Navigational Servitude	NA
	Barrier building	3	Fee Simple	3.6
Water Quality features	Conveyance Tunnel (Calumet to Alsip)	16.6	Utility Easement	
	Conveyance Tunnel (Calumet to Thornton)	27.6	Utility Easement	
	Conveyance Tunnel (Hammond to Thornton)	28.6	Utility Easement	
	Second Reservoir at Thornton	90	Fee Simple	10

Notes and Assumptions:

1. Tunnels are in road rights of way so there is no value.
2. Barriers were assumed to be dams.
3. Values are calculated using assessed values or historical knowledge of the area.
4. Temporary easements areas are included in the hatched area of each map.
5. Utility relocations are estimated at 10% of the Estimated Real Estate Value.
6. No business relocations are required.
7. No environmental concerns on any of the properties.
8. No title concerns on any of the properties.
9. All municipalities will support the projects.
10. Topography was not known at the time of the valuation.
11. No site visits were conducted at the time of the valuation.
12. Connections between barriers and treatment areas were not identified so not included in the valuation.
13. Areas of water were assumed to be Navigational Servitude.
14. No mineral rights were evaluated.
15. No grave sites will be disturbed.
16. No historical sites will be identified on any of the sites.
17. No easements or rights to other owners exist on any of the sites.
18. In the event that the area between the spreadsheet and the maps differ we assumed the large size.

ENCLOSURE B

GENERAL CALCULATIONS



PROJECT TITLE: GLMRIS	COMPUTED BY: LAURA VANDEN BERG	DATE: 3/29/2013
COMPUTATION TITLE:	CHECKED BY:	DATE:

Aggregate
Weight
ton
1.5 x yd³

Project Name: GLMRIS
Phase: Feasibility
Date: 31-May-13
Estimator: Rana Mishra

Second Reservoir at McCook	Reservoir for Chicago and Wilmette Barriers: (Lakefront Hydropsep Alternative			Site Area (acres)	Depth/Height (ft)	Proposed Reservoir:	70 Acres	
	At McCook Expansion site			40	500		3,049,200 sf	
	Required storage:			45	444		Width: 1000 ft	
				50	400		Length: 3049 ft	
				55	364			
				60	333			
				65	308			
				70	286		*Equal to McCook Height	
				75	267			
				80	250			
			85	235				
			90	222				
			95	211				
			100	200				
			*Notes: Height or area will have to vary slightly to allow for freeboard and final design variations					

Second Reservoir at McCook	Reservoir for Stickney Lock:(Flow Bypass Alternative			Site Area (acres)	Depth/Height (ft)	Proposed Reservoir:	120 Acres	
	At McCook Expansion site			80	438		5,227,200 sf	
	Required storage:			85	412		Width: 2000 ft	
				90	389		Length: 2614 ft	
				95	368			
				100	350			
				110	318			
				120	292			
				130	269			
				140	250			
			150	233				
			160	219				
			170	206				
			*Notes: Height or area will have to vary slightly to allow for freeboard and final design variations					

Second Reservoir at Thornton	Reservoir for Alsip Barrier (Flow bypass alternative			Site Area (acres)	Depth/Height (ft)	Proposed Reservoir	170 Acres	
	At Thornton Reservoir location			95	511		7,405,200 sf	
	Required storage:			100	485		Width: 2000 ft	
	48,500 acres-feet			105	462		Length: 3703 ft	
	78,246,665 CY			110	441		1980 ft	
	2,112,659,956.35 CF			115	422		3740 ft	
	15,803,794,307 Gal			120	404			
				125	388			
				130	373			
				135	359			
*Notes: Height or area will have to vary slightly to allow for freeboard and final design variations			140	346	*Close to McCook			
			150	323				
			160	303				
			170	285				
			180	269				
			190	255				
			200	243				

Second Reservoir at Thornton	Reservoir for Calumet City & Hammond Barriers: (Lakefront Hydrologic Separation					Proposed Reservoir	140 Acres	
	At Thornton Reservoir location						6,098,400 sf	
	Required storage:						Width: 2000 ft	
							Length: 3049 ft	
							Width: 2400 ft	
							Length: 2541 ft	
					*Close to McCook			

New Oak Lawn Reservoir	Reservoir for Oak Lawn Barrier: (Midsystem Hydropsep Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative, Flow Bypass Alternative					*account for offsets, site features, etc
	Located in Oak Lawn, 115th St and Cicero Ave (Cemetery)					
	Required storage:					
	530 acre-feet					
	855,067 CY					
	23,086,799 sq CF					
	172,701,257 Gal					
	Site Area:					
	4746643 SF					
	Assumed useable area:					
109 Acres						
80 Acres						
3484800 SF						
Conceptual Design						
Try:						
3:1 berms @ 10 ft tall						
Width of berm:						
62ft						
Inside berm area:						
3019800 SF						
69 acres						
624 acre-feet						
*Notes: Height or area will have to vary slightly to allow for freeboard and final design variations						
InRoads Design (Final Design)						
Cut:						
902583.8 cu yd						
Fill:						
14441.5 cu yd						
Net (Cut):						
888142.3 cu yd						
Storage Volume:						
26004669 cu ft						
Storage Volume:						
597 acre-feet						
Storage Volume:						
194,533,303 Gal						
As initially designed:						
Cut:						
902583.9 cu yd						
Fill:						
14441.6 cu yd						
Net:						
888142.3 cu yd						

New State Line Reservoir	Reservoir for State Line Barrier: (CAWS Buffer Zone Alternative, Hybrid Cal-Sag Open Alternative			Site Area:	6098400	SF	*account for offsets, site features, etc
	140 acre golf course at Brainerd Ave and Burnham Ave				140	Acres	
	Required storage:			Assumed useable area:	83	Acres	
					3615480	SF	
				Conceptual Design			
				Try:	3:1 berms @ 14 ft tall		
				Width of berm:	88 ft		
				Interior berm area:	2857624 SF		
					66 acres		
					787 acre-feet		
*Notes: Height or area will have to vary slightly to allow for freeboard and final design variations							
Pump water from Grand Cal to the south, and include pump station at south edge of reservoir							
130 acres with easement							
InRoads Design (Final Design)							
	3:1 berms @ 14 ft tall						
Width of berm:	88 ft						
InRoads Design (Final Design)							
	Cut:			539121	cu yd		
	Fill:			110319.4	cu yd		
	Net (Cut):			428801.6	cu yd		
	Volume:			43200959	cu ft		
	Volume:			991.8	acre-feet		
	Volume:			323179447	Gal		

Second Reservoir at Thornton	Reservoir for Indiana WQ (Midssystem Hydropsep Alternative, Hybrid CSSC Open Alternative			Site Area (acres)	Depth/Height (ft)	Proposed Reservoir:		80 Acres
	At Thornton Reservoir location						3,484,800 sf	
	Required storage:						Width: 2000 ft	
	16,000 acre-feet						Length: 1742 ft	
	25,813,333 CY							
	696,959,985.60 CF			70	229			
	5,213,622,864 Gal			80	200			
				90	178			
				95	168			
				100	160			
			105	152				
			110	145				
			115	139				
			120	133				
			125	127				
			130	121				
			135	115				
			140	109				
			145	103				
			150	97				
			155	91				
			160	85				
			165	79				
			170	73				
			175	67				
			180	61				
			185	55				
			190	49				
			195	43				
			200	37				
			205	31				
			210	25				
			215	19				
			220	13				
			225	7				
			230	1				
			235					
			240					
			245					
			250					
			255					
			260					
			265					
			270					
			275					
			280					
			285					
			290					
			295					
			300					
			305					
			310					
			315					
			320					
			325					
			330					
			335					
			340					
			345					
			350					
			355					
			360					
			365					
			370					
			375					
			380					
			385					
			390					
			395					
			400					
			405					
			410					
			415					
			420					
			425					
			430					
			435					
			440					
			445					
			450					
			455					
			460					
			465					
			470					
			475					
			480					
			485					
			490					
			495					
			500					
			505					
			510					
			515					
			520					
			525					
			530					
			535					
			540					
			545					
			550					
			555					
			560					
			565					
			570					
			575					
			580					
			585					
			590					
			595					
			600					
			605					
			610					
			615					
			620					
			625					
			630					
			635					
			640					
			645					
			650					
			655					
			660					
			665					
			670					
			675					
			680					
			685					
			690					
			695					
			700					
			705					
			710					
			715					
			720					
			725					
			730					
			735					
			740					
			745					
			750					
			755					
			760					
			765					
			770					
			775					
			780					
			785					
			790					
			795					
			800					
			805					
			810					
			815					
			820					
			825					
			830					
			835					
			840					
			845					
			850					
			855					
			860					
			865					
			870					
			875					
			880					
			885					
			890					
			895					
			900					
			905					
			910					
			915					
			920					
			925					
			930					
			935					
			940					
			945					
			950					
			955					
			960					
			965					
			970					
			975					
			980					
			985					
			990					
			995					
			1000					
			1005					
			1010					
			1015					
			1020					
			1025					
			1030					
			1035					
			1040					
			1045					
			1050					
			1055					
			1060					
			1065					
			1070					
			1075					
			1080					
			1085					
			1090					
			1095					
			1100					
			1105					
			1110					
			1115					
			1120					
			1125					
			1130					
			1135					
			1140					
			1145					
			1150					
			1155					
			1160					
			1165					
			1170					
			1175					
			1180					
			1185					
			1190					
			1195					
			1200					
			1205					
			1210					
			1215					
			1220					
			1225					
			1230					
			1235					
			1240					
			1245					
			1250					
			1255					
			1260					
			1265					
			1270					
			1275					
			1280					
			1285					
			1290					
			1295					
			1300					
			1305					
			1310					
			1315					
			1320					
			1325					
			1330					
			1335					
			1340					
			1345					
			1350					
			1355					
			1360					
			1365					
			1370					
			1375					
			1380					
			1385					
			1390					
			1395					
			1400					
			1405					
			1410					
			1415					
			1420					
			1425					
			1430					
			1435					
			1440					
			1445					
			1450					
			1455					
			1460					
			1465					
			1470					
			1475					
			1480					
			1485					
			1490					
			1495					
			1500					
			1505					
			1510					
			1515					
			1520					
			1525					
			1530					
			1535					
			1540					
			1545					
			1550					
			1555					
			1560					
			1565					
			1570					
			1575					
			1580					
			1585					
			1590					
			1595					
			1600					
			1605					
			1610					
			1615					
			1620					
			1625					
			1630					
			1635					
			1640					
			1645					
			1650					
			1655					
			1660					
			1665					
			1670					
			1675					
			1680					
			1685					
			1690					
			1695					
			1700					
			1705					
			1710					
			1715					
			1720					
			1725					
			1730					
			1735					
			1740					
			1745					
			1750					
			1755					
			1760					
			1765					
			1770					
			1775					
			1780					
			1785					
			1790					
			1795					
			1800					
			1805					
			1810					
			1815					
			1820					
			1825					
			1830					
			1835					
			1840					
			1845					
			1850					
			1855					
			1860					
			1865					
			1870					
			1875					
			1880					
			1885					
			1890					
			1895					
			1900					
			1905					
			1910					
			1915					
			1920					
			1925					
			1930					
			1935					
			1940					
			1945					
			1950					
			1955					
			1960					
			1965					
			1970					
			1975					
			1980					
			1985					
			1990					
			1995					
			2000					
			2005					
			2010					
			2015					
			2020					
			2025					
			2030					
			2035					
			2040					
			2045					
			2050					
			2055					
			2060					
			2065					
			2070					
			2075					
			2080					
			2085					
			2090					
			2095					
			2100					
			2105					
			2110					
			2115					
			2120					
			2125					
			2130					
			2135					
			2140					
			2145					
			2150					
			2155					
			2160					
			2165					
			2170					
			2175					
			2180					
			2185					
			2190					
			2195					
			2200					
			2205					
			2210					
			2215					
			2220					
			2225					
			2230					
			2235					
			2240					
			2245					
			2250					
			2					

120	133
125	128
130	123
135	119
140	114
150	107
160	100

Second Reservoir at McCook	Reservoir for Illinois WQ:(Hybrid Cal Sag Open Alternative, Midystem hydroseg				Proposed Reservoir:		
	At McCook Reservoir location	Site Area (acres)	Depth/Height (ft)			100 Acres	
	Required storage:	25,000 acre-feet	70	357		4,356,000 sf	
		40,333,333 CY	80	312.5		2000 ft	
		1,088,999,977.50 CF	90	278		2178 ft	
		8,146,285,725 Gal	95	263			
			100	250			
			105	239			
			110	227			
			115	217			
	*Notes: Height or area will have to vary slightly to allow for freeboard and final design variations		120	208	Close to McCook		
			125	200			
			130	192			
			135	185			
			140	179			
			150	167			
			160	156			

Second Reservoir at Thornton	Reservoir for Hammond and State line Barrier (CAWS Buffer zone alternative, Hybrid Cal Sag Open				Proposed Reservoir		
	At Thornton Reservoir location	Site Area (acres)	Depth/Height (ft)			100 Acres	
	Required storage:	13,500 acre-feet	95	142		4,356,000 sf	
		21,780,000 CY	100	135		2000 ft	
		588,059,987.85 CF	105	129		2178 ft	
		4,398,994,292 Gal	110	123		1980 ft	
			115	117		2200 ft	
			120	113			
			125	108			
			130	104			
	*Notes: Height or area will have to vary slightly to allow for freeboard and final design variations Potential variation to include the State Line reservoir, for a total capacity of 14,500 acre feet and reservoir size of approx. 110 acres		135	100			
			140	96			
			150	90			
			160	84			
			170	79			
			180	75			
			190	71			
			200	68			

Tunnels				
	Length (miles)	Diameter(ft)	Easement (Acres)	Material displaced (CY)
Wilmette to Chicago	13.1	22	55.42	973,818
Chicago to McCook	12.50	42	83.19	3,386,645
Calumet City to Thornton	5.50	30	28.60	760,267
Hammond to Thornton	5.50	30	28.60	760,267
Alsip to Thornton	5.00	16	17.52	196,594
Stickney to McCook	4.90	14	15.98	147,507
Hammond to Thornton	7.00	14	22.83	210,725
Calumet to Alsip	3.30	13	16.64	137,570
Lawrence to WQ McCook	12.5	32	68.04	1,965,943
Wilmette to Stickney	12.5	13	39.25	324,457
Calumet to Thornton	5.3	30	27.56	732,621
State Line to Thornton	7	14	30.16	210,725
Hammond to Thornton	7.2	14	23.48	216,745

Assumptions: The tunnels will be in the public right of way along the rivers as much as possible
Utility easement will be diameter of tunnel plus 10 feet
Access shafts every 3000 ft along the length, requiring 0.2 acre easement each.

ENCLOSURE C

CUT AND FILL REPORTS

Triangle Volume Report

Report Created: 7/18/2013
Time: 9:45am

Mode: Fence
Input Grid Factor: 1.000000

Original Surface: Stony Creek

Description:
Preference: Default
Type: Existing

Design Surface: Stony Creek New Surface

Description:
Preference: Default
Type: Design

Cut Factor: 1.00
Fill Factor: 1.00

Cut: 24369763.7 cu ft
Fill: 389919.4 cu ft
Net: 23979844.3 cu ft

Cut: 902583.8 cu yd
Fill: 14441.5 cu yd
Net: 888142.4 cu yd

Triangle Volume Report

Report Created: 6/7/2013
Time: 4:17pm

Mode: Entire Surface
Input Grid Factor: 1.000000

Original Surface: State Line

Description:
Preference: Default
Type: Existing

Design Surface: State Line Reservoir 594

Description: Created from roadway designer
Preference: Default
Type: Design

Cut Factor: 1.00
Fill Factor: 1.00

Cut: 14556267.8 cu ft
Fill: 2978624.8 cu ft
Net: 11577643.0 cu ft

Cut: 539121.0 cu yd
Fill: 110319.4 cu yd
Net: 428801.6 cu yd